UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

JONELLE THOMAS,)	CASE NO.: 1:05CV1871
Petitioner,)	JUDGE JOHN ADAMS
v.)	
v.)	
HARRY HAGEMAN,)	ORDER AND DECISION
Respondent.)	
respondent.)	

This matter comes before the Court on Objections and Exceptions to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation by the Petitioner, Jonelle Thomas ("Petitioner"). This action was referred to Magistrate Judge Hemann for a Report and Recommendation ("Report") on the Petition for Habeas Corpus. The Magistrate found both of Petitioner's grounds for relief not well taken and recommended that this Court dismiss the action. Petitioner timely filed objections to the Report. The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to conduct a de novo review of those portions of the Report to which an objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1). The Court has been advised, having reviewed the Petition, Respondent's Return of Writ and exhibits attached thereto, Petitioner's Traverse and Brief, the Report, Petitioner's Objections thereto, exhibits and applicable law.

It is first noted that the objections made are merely reiterations of the arguments made in the Petition for Habeas Corpus. Having considered *de novo* those portions of the Magistrate's Report to which objection is made by the Petitioner, it is determined that there appears to be no factual disputes which would warrant a hearing. It is further determined, based on a *de novo*

Case: 1:05-cv-01871-JRA Doc #: 15 Filed: 05/30/06 2 of 2. PageID #: 331

review of the record in light of Petitioner's objections, this Court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge and adopts the report and recommendation as its own. Therefore, the Report by the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED IN WHOLE and the findings of fact and conclusions of law are fully incorporated by reference herein. As such, the Petition for Habeas Corpus is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice. No further articulation of the Court's reasoning need be provided. *Tuggle v. Seabold*, 806 F.2d 87, 92-93 (6th Cir. 1986).

So ordered.

May 30, 2006

<u>s/</u> <u>John R. Adams</u> JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE